APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,200	05/15/2000	YASUHARU ASANO	3712174.00779	3922

29175   7590   08/20/2010

K&L Gates LLP
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690

EXAMINER
SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 May 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,7-24,27,30-32 and 34-41* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,7-24,27,30-32 and 34-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 October 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1.　　This office action is in response to applicant's remarks filed 5/19/10.

Claims 1, 4, 7-24, 27, 30-32, and 34-41 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2.　　Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 1/26/10, with respect to

rejected claims 1, 4, 7-24, 27, 30-32 and 34-37 rejected under 35 USC 103

(a) as being unpatentable under US Patent No. 5,652,896 (Yamauchi) in

view of US Patent No. 6,182,026 (Tillman) have been fully considered and

are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references

individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck &

Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

More specifically, Applicant argues on page 11, "Regarding

independent Claims 1 and 27, the Office Action admits that "Yamauchi

does not explicitly disclose re-converting means for reconverting the

confirmed at least one representation to a re-converted representation

within the same first natural language by exchanging word order of the at

least one representation." Office Action, page 7. The Office action asserts

that Tillmann teaches the re-converting means as claimed." Applicant's

further argue, p.12, "Applicant respectfully submits that Tillmann fails to

disclose at least "re-converting the confirmed at least one representation to

a re-converted representation within the same first natural language by

exchanging word order of the at least one representation" as recited in

independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 17, 27,

and 31." Each of these arguments consist of the references individually and

to not consider the references a combination of elements that make up the

claimed invention. The Examiner does not claim that Tillmann teaches the

above elements, the Examiner explicitly claims that Tillmann teaches, see

previous office action, claim 1, "re-converting means for re-converting at

least one representation to a re-converted representation within the same

first natural language by exchanging word order of the at least one

representation." The Examiner notes that this is not addressed by the

applicant anywhere in the arguments, the applicant has addressed the

entire claim re-converting element as not being taught by either Yamauchi

or Tillman, and the Examiner agrees with this argument, however, in

combination the elements are make obvious and each component of the limitation is present.

Applicant further argues, p. 12, "Specifically, Tillmann discloses a general translation architecture based on Bayesian decision theory. Tillmann, abstract, col. 2, lines 49 to 50, Figure 1. The disclose translation method and architecture executes a global search to provide a result, which is used to generate the sequence of target words. Tillmann, col. 2, lines 49 to 67, Figure 1. The generated sequence of target words, or target language text, is provided as the output. Tillmann, col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 4. Moreover, the output is not a confirmed representation of the first natural language, but rather, is selected by the Bayesian decision theory. Accordingly, Tillmann fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "re-converting the confirmed at least one representation to a re-converted representation within the same first natural language by exchanging word order of the at least one representation" as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 17, 27, and 31."

The Examiner notes the discussion of the Bayesian decision theory and global search is irrelevant to the current and previously cited rejection, wherein it is not claimed how or why the word or based on what the word

order is exchanged in the at least one representation. However, the fact is

it is made explicitly clear that Tillmann disclose exchanging the word order

in at least one representation, as claimed ("Using this information, we may

reorder the input sentence such that its word order matches better the word

order in the target language", Tillman C.6 lines 15-18). Thus, in

combination with Yamauchi, before translation, it would benefit Yamauchi

in exchanging word order of a converted and confirmed representation, in

that the target language to improve the translation process by implementing

the word order exchanging transformation (C.2 lines 45-48, and 58-60-his

explicit discussion of exchanging word order of the source string). Thus

applicant's arguments remain unpersuasive, as the result of the

combination of Yamauchi with Tillmann provide each and every claim

element as presented by the applicant.

Applicant further argues on page 13, regarding claims 38 and 39,

"Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that, at a minimum, the cited

prior art, even if properly combinable, fails to teach "each of the plurality of

representations of the second natural language has a one-to-one

correspondence with a representation of a third natural language;

confirmation means for confirming one representation of the second natural

language that is closest in meaning to the first natural language; processing

means for translating the one representation of the second natural

language to the third natural language;" as claimed in Claims 38 and 39.

The Examiner recognizes that Yamauchi fails to teach a one-to-one

correspondence as claimed, and relies on Fushimoto's French to English

representations in Fig. 8 to cure the deficiencies of Yamauchi. Office

Action, pages 21 to 22. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the

present amendments, that Fushimoto fails to cure the deficiencies of

Yamauchi. Specifically, as argued previously, one French word

corresponds to multiple English words. For example, **the French word**

"trouver" corresponds to the English words "find," detect," "deem,"

"discover," and "judge." Fushimoto, Fig. 8. Similarly, the German word

"finden" corresponds to the English words "find" and "discover;" and the

English word "find" corresponds to the French words "trouver" and

"estimer." Fushimoto, Fig. 8. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that

independent Claims 38 and 39 are patentably distinguished from Yamauchi

in view of Fushimoto as asserted in the Office Action, and thus, are each

currently in condition for allowance."

However, the bolded interpretation of Fushimoto is incorrect, wherein the French word "trouver" only corresponds to **one English word and one German word, the English word being "find" and the German word being "finden."** This is what the Examiner has explained in the previous office action. In column 7 lines 1-17, Fushimoto is explicitly detailing the word "trouver" as being stored only because of the one word "find", having a one to one correspondence, and has no correspondence with "detect", "deem", "discover" and "judge", and "estimer" which has more than a one to one correspondence is not stored, however, as also previously explained, "decouvir" is also stored, because of a one to one correspondence with "discover" but "reveler" is not stored, because of no one to one correspondence. Thus, applicants arguments remain unpersuasive, based on the combination of Yamauchi, Tillmann and Fushimoto.

Applicant's arguments regarding dependent claims 4, 7-16, 18-24, 30, 23, 34-37, 40 and 41, are also deemed unpersuasive as they depend from the above argued unpersuasive subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the

basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claim 1, 4, 7-24, 27, 30-32, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi et al. (Yamauchi, US

5,652,896) in view Tillman et al. (Tillman, US 6,182,026).

As per **claims 1 and 27**, Yamauchi et al. discloses an apparatus

comprising:

input means for inputting a first natural language (C.10.lines 30-32);

converting means for converting the first natural language inputted by

the input means into a plurality of representations within the same first

natural language (Fig. 88-his cursor in a menu box containing a plurality of

converted representations in the same natural language of a first natural

language input, C.19-C.20-his plurality of representations in his source

language, Japanese, C.50 lines 34-45-his plurality of representations in the

source language as intermediate structures (S), instead of target language

patterns generated from source language, C.10.line 53, C.11.line 48-55-

intermediate structure), the plurality of representations replacing

postpositional words of the first natural language (ibid, Fig. 73, 74, Fig. 88,

the Examiner notes, postpositional phrases/words, all are included first

natural language, and are replaced in order to develop his plurality of

representations in the first natural language, C.20 lines 13-62-describe

alternate words replacing postpositional words, and having "sem" left over

in a pattern, functioning as an auxiliary, however, does not teach having a

source language that precludes postpositional phrases from being replaced

by another representation, furthermore the entire source language

sentence is processed, including postpositional phrases, C.20 lines 61-67,

and may be replaced, C.21 lines 18-25-his "sem"/postpositional word and

further word creation to the structure);

confirmation means for confirming at least one representation

converted by the converting means as being closest in meaning to the

inputted first natural language (Fig. 88 his cursor providing confirmation

means for closest in meaning of one of a plurality of representations of an

input, C.50 lines 45-47-his selection as the intended/inherent closest in

meaning, C.13.lines 44-50-generations of the intermediate structure (S)

from the source input, C.38.lines 27-29);

processing means for translating the re-converted representation to a second natural language (C.50 lines 45-57, his translation of the re-converted sentence, and Figs. 75-79 and C.39 lines 40-49-his translation as the translation of the word order exchanged representations); and

output means for outputting the second natural language processed by the processing means (ibid, C.38.lines 55, 56-his display unit as per claim 27-output step…on a display section).

Yamauchi does not explicitly disclose re-converting means for re-converting the confirmed at least one representation to a re-converted representation within the same first natural language by exchanging word order of the at least one representation.

However, Tillman teaches the above re-converting means for re-converting at least one representation to a re-converted representation within the same first natural language by exchanging word order of the at least one representation ("Using this information, we may reorder the input sentence such that its word order matches better the word order in the target language", Tillman C.6 lines 15-18). The Examiner thus invokes KSR, wherein the above components of confirmation taught by Yamauchi and re-conversion of source natural language for presentation to the

machine translator taught by Tillman produce the predictable result and

benefit of determining and confirming the first representation in first natural

language, the translation machine process is simplified by a re-conversion

of the first language in order to arrange the word order of the first language

in a manner more conducive to the target language word order as realized

in the correct grammatical construct of the target language.

As per **claim 4**, Yamauchi with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. Yamauchi et al. further

discloses:

the processing means carries out processing by template (Fig 28-the

template-corresponding to processing means for translation).

As per **claim 7**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends. Yamauchi et al. further

discloses:

the converting means further converts the first natural language

inputted by the input means into third language (C.38.lines 7-9-retranslation

is interpreted as a third language from a first language, C.37.lines 39-59, in

addition C.52.lines 35-38-Kana to Kanji to English conversion).

As per **claim 8**, Yamauchi et al with Tillman make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 8 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the converting means converts plural representations into single representation with respect to representation of natural language inputted by the input means (C.14.lines 17-22).

As per **claim 9**, Yamauchi et al with Tillman make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends. Yamauchi et al. further disclose:

the converting means converts polysemous representation into plural univocal representations with respect to representation of natural language inputted by the input means (C.14.lines 50-61).

As per **claim 10**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the converting means carries out conversion by at least one of merger (integration), division, deletion, replacement and exchange of order with respect to representation of natural language inputted by the input means (C.21.lines 60-67, C.22.line 48-C.23.line 16-replacement and

deletion with respect to the source language is done with the reference

sentence with respect to the intermediate structure).

As per **claim 11**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 11 depends. Yamauchi et al. further

discloses:

the input means inputs natural language by speech (C.37.lines 42-

45).

As per **claim 12**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 11, upon which claim 12 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

the confirmation means confirms, only once, natural language

inputted by speech to the input means (C.37.lines 42-45, C.38.lines 40-56).

As per **claim 13**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 13 depends. Yamauchi et al. further

discloses:

the input means inputs natural language character by character

(C.37.lines 42, 43-keyboard input).

As per **claim 14**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the limitations of claim 13, upon which claim 14 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the confirmation means confirms, only once, natural language inputted by character at the input means (C.37.lines 42, 43 C.38.lines 40-56).

As per **claims 15**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 15 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the first natural language is inputted to the input means (see claim 1), the converting means converts first language inputted via the input means into a second representation of the second language and converts it into first representation of the first language having one-to-one correspondence with respect to the second representation, and the confirmation means carries out confirmation by using the first representation (C.38.lines 24-35).

As per **claims 16 and 30**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the processing means translates the first language into the second

language on the basis of conversion at the converting means and

confirmation at the confirmation means and the output means outputs the

second language translated by the processing means (C.38.lines 24-56).

As per **claim 17 and 31**, Yamauchi et al. discloses a natural

language processing apparatus comprising:

input means for inputting natural language (C.15.lines 25-27,

C.37.lines 39, 40);

a plurality of processing means for implementing processing of the

natural language (C.10.lines 44-67, C.11.lines 48-55, C.37.lines 42-45,

speech input processing and analysis processing, Fig. 115 text editor

processing), at least one processing means configured to convert the first

natural language inputted into a plurality of representations of the natural

language (Fig. 88-his cursor pointed at the plurality of representations,

C.50 lines 34-45-his plurality of representations in the source language as

intermediate structures (S), instead of target language patterns generated

from source language)

a plurality of confirmation means for confirming result of processing

with respect to the natural language (Fig. 61-input confirmation in the edit

area, C.38.lines 25-30-input sentence structure), at least one confirmation

means configured to confirm at least one representation being closest in

meaning to the inputted first natural language (Fig. 88-his cursor to the

closest/intended meaning, C.50 lines 45-47 further confirmation means);

output means for outputting the processed natural language

(C.37.lines 55-59, C.50 lines 45-47), wherein a second processing means

for converting the natural language and a second confirmation means for

confirming result of the second processing (C.38.lines 40-45-second

processing including information retrieval processing by natural language

wherein the confirmation is the user selection of a presented word-to-word

translation, C.38.lines 1-9, 16, 17, which includes retrieval processing by

the natural language input) means are provided at a stage preceding a first

processing means to thereby carry out execution in advance of

confirmation of the first processing means to delete confirmation of result of

the first processing means (Fig. 78-step 19, step 20, Fig. 79 steps 25,

26...Yamauchi provides multiple confirmation means, however, in advance

of his step 26, contains an operation to delete confirmation-his deletion by

selecting "Y" which makes null the previous confirmation/taken as deletion,

and provides a current confirmation translation).

Yamauchi does not explicitly disclose a plurality of reconverting means for re-converting the plurality of confirmed representations into a plurality of re-converted representations of the natural language by exchanging word order within the plurality of representations.

However, Tillman teaches the above a plurality of reconverting means for re-converting a representations into a plurality of re-converted representations of the natural language by exchanging word order within the plurality of representations ("Using this information, we may reorder the input sentence such that its word order matches better the word order in the target language", Tillman C.6 lines 15-18, C.2 lines 50-55-his hardware). The Examiner thus invokes KSR, wherein the above components of confirmation taught by Yamauchi and re-conversion of source natural language for presentation to the machine translator taught by Tillman produce the predictable result and benefit of determining and confirming the first representation in first natural language, the translation machine process is simplified by a re-conversion of the first language in order to arrange the word order of the first language in a manner more conducive to the target language word order as realized in the correct grammatical construct of the target language.

As per **claim 18**, Yamauchi with Tillman make obvious all the
limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 18 depends. Yamauchi et al.
further discloses:

processing by the first processing means is machine translation
processing, kana-kanji conversion processing, information retrieval
processing by natural language, or representation conversion processing
by natural language (C.38.lines 40-56- translating being the first processing
means, and the translation is displayed).

As per **claim 19**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the
limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 19 depends. Yamauchi et al.
further discloses:

processing by the second processing means is machine translation
processing, kana-kanji conversion processing, information retrieval
processing by natural language, or representation conversion processing
by natural language (C.38.lines 40-45-second processing including
information retrieval processing by natural language wherein the
confirmation is the user selection of a presented word-for-word translation
of natural, C.38.lines 1-9, 16, 17, which includes retrieval processing by the
natural language input).

As per **claim 20 and 32**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious

all of the limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 20 depends. Yamauchi

et al. further discloses:

at a stage preceding the second processing means (the speech or

OCR input necessarily precedes the above cited second processing

means), a third processing means and third confirmation means for

confirming result thereof (speech input or OCR input and confirmation

thereof in the input Edit section, C.37.lines 39-44, Fig 61 "Editing",

"Japanese", "original"), wherein the third confirmation means is coupled to

the portion after the second or subsequent processing means, or wherein

the third confirmation means is merged or integrated into the second

confirmation means or confirmation means of the stage succeeding thereto

to carry out postponement of confirmation (C.37.lines 39-55, Fig. 65 items

21, 26, Fig 85 items 62, 66, the speech or OCR input and confirmation

means are coupled to the information retrieval from the information

recording unit which contains a plurality of information databases, which

inherently provides, until the input is confirmed-the process of receiving the

input by speech and confirming by selection of the input to be implemented

in another process, postponement of the machine translation is carried

out).

As per **claim 21**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 20, upon which claim 21 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

the second confirmation and the third confirmation means are merged

or integrated gives result of processing as numeric value to present the

numeric value (C.19.lines 49-57-the recognized and confirmed words

inputted and confirmed integrated identified processed natural language for

retrieval, have calculated scores).

As per **claim 22**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 20, upon which claim 22 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

the first processing means carries out machine translation (C.37.line

50)and the third processing means carries out speech recognition

(C.37.lines 44, 45).

As per **claim 23**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 20, upon which claim 23 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

speech recognition processing means for carrying out speech

recognition of natural language inputted to the input means (C.37.lines 43-

45), recognition result confirmation means for confirming recognition result

at the speech recognition processing means (C.51.line 63-C.52.line 15-

input editing means, wherein the input is confirmed by selection), machine

translation means for implementing machine translation to the result

confirmed at the recognition result confirmation means, (C.37.line 48), and

translation result confirmation means for confirming translation result at the

machine translation means (C.37.lines 55-59).

wherein representation conversion processing means for converting

representation and representation conversion confirming means for

confirming result of the conversion (C.10.lines 30-32, C.13.lines 44-50,

C.23.lines 26-59, C.32.line 59-C.33.line 6, C.38.lines 27-29) thereof are

supplemented at the preceding stage of the machine translation processing

(C.23.lines 41-59) means to thereby carry out execution in advance of

processing by the translation result confirmation means (C.23.lines 58, 59)

to omit the translation result confirming means of the stage succeeding to

the machine translation processing means (C.23.lines 58, 59, Fig. 28, Fig.

29-the translation confirming means has been omitted by the confirmation

of the original input sentence conversion means-the confirmed sentence is

translated without further confirmation, C.23.line 59, "the translation is

completed").

As per **claim 24**, Yamauchi et al. with Tillman make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 23, upon which claim 24 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

postponement of processing by the recognition result confirming

means which merges or integrates the recognition result confirmation result

with the representation conversion result confirming means existing at the

stage succeeding thereto is carried out (C.37.lines 39-55, Fig. 65 items 21,

26, Fig 85 items 62, 66, the speech input and confirmation means are

coupled to the information retrieval from the information recording unit

which contains a plurality of information databases, which inherently

provides, until the input is confirmed-the process of receiving the input by

speech and confirming by selection of the input to be implemented in

another process, postponement of the machine translation is carried out).

As per **claims 34 and 36**, Yamauchi with Tillman make obvious a

natural language processing apparatus as set forth in claim 1. Tillman

further teaches wherein the re-converted representation has the same

meaning as the at least one representation (see claim 1, re-converted

discussion, wherein the word order is thus exchanged, between the

different patterns, and thus the representation is thus exchanged, yet the

meaning remains the same).

As per **claims 35 and 37**, Yamauchi with Tillman make obvious a

natural language processing apparatus as set forth in claim 17. Tillman

further teaches wherein the plurality of re-converted representations have

the same meaning as the plurality of representations (see claim 1, re-

converted discussion, wherein the word order is thus exchanged, between

the different patterns, and thus the representation is thus exchanged, yet

the meaning remains the same).

5.   Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Fushimoto (US 5,742,505).

As per **claims 38 and 39**, Yamauchi et al discloses a natural

language apparatus comprising:

input means for inputting a first natural language (C.15.lines 25-27,

C.37.lines 39, 40);

converting means for converting the first natural language into a

plurality of representations of a second natural language (Fig. 88-his menu

of items, C.50 lines 24-45-as his first natural language, and second natural

language)

confirmation means for confirming one representation of the second

natural language that is the closest in meaning to the first natural language

(Fig. 88-his cursor to the item representing the closest in intended

meaning, C.38.lines 24-35-confirmation of second translation, Fig. 67 items

31 and 34);

outputting on a display section (C.38 lines 55, 56-his translation on

his display unit)

Yamauchi lacks explicitly teaching wherein each of the plurality of

representations of the second natural language has a one-to-one

correspondence with a representation of a third natural language and the

third language being different from both the first and second languages,

and processing means for translating the one representation of the second

natural language to a third natural language; and outputting the third

natural language.

However, Fushimoto teaches a plurality of representations of the

second natural language has a one-to-one correspondence with a

representation of a third natural language (Fig. 8 his French to English

representations, see Fig. 8, Fig. 10, and C.7 lines 1-17, the French word,

"trouver" is explicitly in a **one-to-one** correspondence with the word English

word "find", and "decouvrir" is explicitly in a **one-to-one** correspondence

with the English word discover) and the third language being different from

both the first and second language (C.7 lines 25-31-his French, German

and English), and processing means for translating the one representation

of the second natural language to a third natural language; and outputting

the third natural language (Fushimoto, C.7 lines 1-23-his translation and

display of his third language). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify

Yamauchi's second language representation with a third language

representation, having a plurality of representations with one-to-one

correspondence with a third language, the third language being different

from both the first and second languages, providing the benefit of using an

intermediate language to translate from a first language to a second,

providing there is a better translation between the first and third language,

wherein the third language can further be accurately translated and

outputted in the desired language (Fushimoto, C.7 lines 1-23-as his chain

translation including three languages and output).

6.   Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Fushimoto (US 5,742,505), as
applied to claims 38 and 39 above, and further in view of Fushimoto
(Fushimoto II, US 5,541,837).

As per **claims 40 and 41**, which depend on claims 38 and 39
respectively, Yamauchi and Fushimoto make obvious a natural language
processing apparatus as set forth in claim 38, but lack wherein the one
representation of the second natural language that is translated into the
third natural language is at least one sentence. However, Fushimoto II
teaches at least one representation of a second natural language that is
translated into a third natural language is at least one sentence (C.8 lines
23-27-his application of his translation of words as it applies to sentences,
see abstract, his target language translation translated into the third
language).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to
one ordinarily skilled in the art, to substitute the sentences of Fushimoto II
with Yamauchi and Fushimoto, thus providing a disambiguated translation
result in a desired target language (i.e. a third language one-to-one
correspondence translation).

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**

FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to

expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a

first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final

action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory

period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the

mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final

action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to LAMONT M. SPOONER whose

telephone number is 571-272-7613. The examiner can normally be

reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7602.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

                                    /David R Hudspeth/
                                    Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

lms
8/14/10